



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/501,925	07/28/2004	Jann Schmidt	255898US0PCT	2156

22850 7590 12/14/2006

C. IRVIN MCCLELLAND
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

AHMAD, NASSER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1772

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

6

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/501,925	SCHMIDT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nasser Ahmad	1772	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Terminal Disclaimer

1. The terminal disclaimer filed on 9/27/2006 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of U.S. Patent No. 7046903 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Rejections Withdrawn

2. Claims 1-4 and 6-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Schmidt (7046903) made in the last Office Action of 7/28/06 has been withdrawn in view of the amendment filed on 9/27/2006.

3. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Schmidt in view of Khanarian (5881201) made in the last Office Action of 7/28/06 has been withdrawn in view of the amendment filed on 9/27/2006.

4. Claims 1-4 and 6-18 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 7046903 made in the last Office Action of 7/28/06 has been withdrawn in view of the terminal disclaimer filed on 9/27/2006.

5. Claim 6 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 7046903 in view of Khananrian made in the last Office Action of 7/28/06 has been withdrawn in view of the terminal disclaimer filed on 9/27/2006.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Khanarian (5881201).

Khanarian relates to a light-guide body (figures 3A and 3B) which has at least one light-entry surface (from the left side in the drawings) and at least one light-exit surface (shown by the arrows exiting the upper surface of the body), the ratio of the light-exit surface area to the light-entry surface area being at least greater than 1 because of the surface area dimension of the two surfaces. The light-guiding layer comprises at least 60% by weight (col. 5, line 1), expressed in terms of the weight of the light-guiding layer, of polymethyl methacrylate (col. 4, lines 40-43) and from 0.001 to 0.08% by weight (col. 5, line 1); expressed in terms of the weight of the light-guiding layer, of spherical particles (col. 4, lines 5-39) with an average diameter in the range of from 0.3 to 40 microns (col. 4, line 10), and the light-exit surface of the light-guiding layer is provided with structurings (figures 3A and 3B). However, Khanarian fails to teach that the ratio of

Art Unit: 1772

the light exit surface area to the light entry surface area is at least 4. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Khanarian by providing the ratio of at least 4 because figures 3A or 3B shows the light exiting surface to be comparatively much larger than the light entry area, based on optimization through routine experimentation, for optimum light scattering properties. For claim 2, the ratio of at least 20, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Khanarian by providing the ratio of at least 20 because figures 3A or 3B shows the light exiting surface to be comparatively much larger than the light entry area, based on optimization through routine experimentation, for optimum light scattering properties.

For claim 3, the thickness of the light guiding layer of 1-4 mm, see col. 6, lines 31-33.

The particles of claims 4-5 can be of plastic, such as polystyrene (col. 4, line 36).

Figure 3B shows the light-exit surface having a uniform structuring for claim 6.

For claim 7, the non-uniform structuring is shown in figure-3A by the wedge shaped surface.

Regarding claim 8, based on figures 3A and 3B, the light exit surface structuring is inherently in line or point form.

For claim 9, the methyl methacrylate is at least 90% of the light-guide body (col. 5, line 1).

Claim 10, the average diameter of the particle is in the range of 0.01-10 micron which reads on the claimed range of 1.4-10 microns.

Art Unit: 1772

For claim 11, Khanarian, in col. 5, line 1 teaches that the particles is present in an amount of 0.01% by weight, which falls in the claimed range of 0.0005 to 0.08% by weight.

Regarding claims 12-13, the refractive index of light guiding layer would inherently exhibit in the range of from 1.48 to 1.54 or the light transmission is from 75-92% because the polymethyl methacrylate material being the same as claimed.

Claim 14 is shown in figure-3A.

For claim 15, the at least one surface, which is parallel to the light entry surface is configured to be a reflective layer because the surface opposite the light entry surface is not shown to permit light exiting, or in the alternative, the edge surface of the reflective layer in figures 3A and 3B at the entry surface is found to be parallel to the light entry surface.

For claim 16, the light guide body is made by molding.

Regarding claim 17, he components (C) and (D) are interpreted to be zero and the components (A) and (B) are disclosed by Khanarian.

Claim 18, the light source is shown in figures 3A and 3B as CCFL, which is a fluorescent light.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nasser Ahmad whose telephone number is 571-272-1487. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM, and on alternate Friday.

Art Unit: 1772

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on 571-272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Nasser Ahmad 12/10/06
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1772

N. Ahmad.
December 10, 2006.